

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application, with Claim 1 being the sole independent claim.

It is gratefully acknowledged that Claims 8-15 remain objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enokido et al. (U.S. Pat. No.5,461,672) in view of Nagai (U.S. Pat. No.5,369,788), and further in view of Hansen et al. (U.S. Pat. No.6,370,362).

Claims 1, 3-5 and 7 are amended. No new subject matter is presented.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner states that Enokido et al. in view of Nagai, and further in view of Hansen et al., renders the claim obvious. Amended Claim 1 teaches, in part, a mobile communication device comprising a main body; a slide cover sliding between a closed position and an opened position; and *a coiled compression spring providing a sliding elastic force to slide the slide cover from the closed position to the opened position.*

Enokido et al. discloses a mobile communication device comprising a main body 1; a slide cover 4 sliding between a closed position and an opened position; and coiled compression springs 44 and 56d (FIGs. 1-3 and 10, col. 7 lines 10-21). The coiled springs in Enokido et al. provide elastic force to lock steel balls 45 or contactor 56a (col. 7 lines 10-21 and col. 8 lines 19-22), but are unable to slide the slide cover 4. The slide cover 4 is slid manually between the closed position and the opened position (col. 3 lines 29-33). Enokido et al. fails to disclose the limitation of *a coiled compression spring providing a sliding elastic force to slide the slide cover from the closed position to the opened position* taught by Amended Claim 1.

Nagai discloses a mobile communication device comprising a main body 30; and a slide cover 40 sliding between a closed position and an opened position (FIGs. 2 and 5-6). The slide cover 40 is slid manually between the closed position and the opened position (col. 3 lines 3-4). Nagai fails to disclose the limitation of *a coiled compression spring providing a sliding elastic force to slide the slide cover from the closed position to the opened position* taught by Amended Claim 1.

Hansen et al. discloses a mobile communication device comprising a main body 2; a slide cover 5 sliding between a closed position and an opened position; and a coiled spring 89 for providing a sliding elastic force to slide the slide cover from the closed position to the opened position (FIGs. 2 and 8-9). The coiled spring 89 of Hansen et al. is a coiled tension spring (col. 6 lines 41-44), which extends at the closed position and expands at the opened position, in contrast to the coiled compression spring of Amended Claim 1. A coiled compression spring is inoperable in the structure of Hansen et al. Conversely, a coiled tension spring is inoperable in the structure of Amended Claim 1. Hansen et al. fails to disclose the limitation of *a coiled compression spring providing a sliding elastic force to slide the slide cover from the closed position to the opened position* taught by Amended Claim 1.

Clearly, Amended Claim 1 structurally differs from Enokido et al., Nagai, Hansen et al., or any combination thereof.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely Claims 1-15, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul J. Farrell", written over a horizontal line.

Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, PC
333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475

PJF/DGL/mk